DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 131 277 CE 008 714

AUTHOR	Whiteford, Emma B.
TITLE	Special Needs Students in Regular Home Economics Programs: 1976 Survey of Selected Minnesota Secondary Teachers. Report of a Study.
INSTITUTION	Minnesota Univ., St. Paul. Div. of Home Economics Education.
SPONS AGENCY	Minnesota State Dept. of Education, St. Paul. Div. of Vocational and Technical Education.
PUB DATE	Aug 76
NOTE	55p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Educational Needs; *Exceptional (Atypical); Exceptional Students; Gifted; *Handicapped Students; Home Economics Education; *Home Economics Teachers; Low Ability Students; *Needs Assessment; School Surveys; State Surveys; *Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS	Minnesota

ABSTRACT

As Phase I of a Minnesota home economics curriculum improvement project, a study was conducted to determine the number of special needs students who were programmed into regular home economics classes in the State of Minnesota in 1976 and the extent to which secondary home economics teachers identified them and made provision for their needs. A questionnaire was sent to a stratified sample of 364 secondary teachers, and 298 responses were received. Of these, 260 or 71.4%, sent data which was analyzed systematically; free response was summarized from all of the 298 returns, which represent 81.9% of the sample population of Minnesota home economics teachers. The results provide information for use in teacher-training programs as increasing numbers of students are "mainstreamed" into regular programs instead of being provided for in segregated programs. A detailed description of the methodology, summary of major findings, and a selected reference list are included. Appendixes include the questionnaire used to survey home economics teachers, a list of modifications in home economics and/or space and equipment reported by the teachers, and lists of concerns of the teachers relative to special needs students in home economics classrooms. (Author/WL)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED131277

SPECIAL NEEDS STUDENTS IN REGULAR HOME ECONOMICS PROGRAMS: 1976 SURVEY OF SELECTED MINNESOTA SECONDARY TEACHERS

Report of a Study

by

Emma B. Whiteford, Professor

Division of Home Economics Education

Department of Vocational and Technical Education

College of Education

University of Minnesota at Minneapolis-Saint Paul

for the

Special Needs Programs

Vocational--Technical Division

State Department of Education

Saint Paul, Minnesota

August, 1976

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

OE 008 714

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The investigator gratefully acknowledges the assistance of all who contributed to the development and successful completion of this study: the staff, consultants, officials who provided extensive background data, participating teachers who provided information concerning their programs and instructional needs as well as interested individuals in general. Members of the Vocational-Technical Division, Minnesota Office of Education, provided indispensable assistance throughout the study.

The following individuals have made especially helpful contributions to the study in terms of consultation and/or technical assistance:

The University of Minnesota, Saint Paul-Minneapolis:
Dean Jack C. Merwin, and Professors: Douglas Anderson, John Anderson, Douglas Berdie, Roxana R. Ford (retired), Joan McFadden, Jerome Moss, Jr., Maynard C. Reynolds, Brandon Smith, Marjorie Thurston (retired), Frank W. Wood

Minnesota Office of Education:
Hal Birkland, Audrey Grote, J. Thomas Strom, Janice Templin, Robert Van Tries, Assistant Commissioner of Vocational-Technical Education, Gregory J. Waddick, Assistant Commissioner, Division of Planning and Development.

A number of administrators, consultants, supervisors and teachers provided technical assistance and a variety of helpful information and/or materials.

Among these are:

Larry Anderson, Career Education Center, Audubon; Cliff Clausen, Lakes Vocational Center, Detroit Lakes; Elsie Gerner, Home Economics Teacher, Blackduck; Keith Gilbertson, Lakes Vocational Center, Detroit Lakes; Muriel Lehman, Home Economics Consultant, Duluth; Arlo Renchler, Secondary Vocational Education, Brainerd; Kathleen Stuart, Home Economics Supervisor, St. Paul; Ann Zweber, Home Economics Teacher, Duluth; Arthur Taylor, Consultant, Special Education, St. Paul; Joan Wilkosz, Consultant, Home Economics, Minneapolis; Charles Wrobel, Vocational Education for Special Needs, 196 AVTI.

Many helpful suggestions and materials were received by telephone, letter and informal conferences. Expressions of interest and helpfulness in the conduct of this study are appreciated.

3 Emma B. Whiteford

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
	ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
Section		
I	STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM	1
II	PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THIS STUDY	2
	General Phases of the Project	2
	Assumptions of the Study	3
	Limitations of the Study	4
	Definition of Terms	4
III	METHODOLOGY	5
	Development of the Survey Form	5
	Population and Sample	6
	Sampling Procedures	6
	Follow-up Procedures	6
	Analysis of the Follow-up Data	7
	Analysis of the Data	7
IV	RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS PROVIDED BY THE SURVEY DATA	8
	Information about the Home Economics Teachers in The Sample Population	8
	Questions with Responses Provided by the Data of the Study	8
V	SUMMARY OF THE MAJOR FINDINGS	18
VI	SELECTED REFERENCES	22
Tables		
1	The Numbers and Percents of Survey Responses from Home Economics Teachers in Each of the Secondary School Programs Summarizing the Surveys Sent and Follow-up Procedures in Relation to Total Responses	23
2	The Numbers and Percents of Teachers Who Identified Their Major Teaching Responsibilities as Reported from a Sample of Minnesota Secondary Home Economics Teachers	24
3	The Numbers and Percents of Teachers Who Responded Relative to the Number of Years of Experience in Teaching Home Economics	24
4	The Numbers and Percents of Teachers Who Identified Their Age Group Membership	25
5	The Numbers and Percents of Students Enrolled in Regular Classes in Four Types of School Programs Divided on Special Needs Students and Regular Students	25
6	Rank Order of Numbers and Types of Female Special Needs Students Enrolled in Regular Classes in Four Types of School Programs	26
7	Rank Order of Numbers and Types of Male Special Needs Students Enrolled in Regular Classes in Four Types of School Programs	27

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

Page

Tables (continued)

8 The Number of Teachers Who Made Modifications in Their Regular Classes in Four Types of School Programs Because of Special Needs Students Classified by Type of Need and the Total Number and Percents of Comments 28

9 The Numbers and Percents of Teachers Who Received Formal Preparation for Teaching Special Needs Students in Each of the Special Needs Areas in Four Types of School Programs and the Total Population 29

10 The Numbers and Percents of Teachers Who Received Informal Preparation for Teaching Special Needs Students in Each of the Areas of Informal Preparation in Four Types of School Programs and the Total Population 30

11 The Attitudes on Teaching Special Needs Students in Regular Classes Measured on a Scale of One to Four in Four Types of School Programs 31

12 The Numbers and Percents of Teachers Who Identified Concerns in Working with Special Needs Students in Regular Classes in Four Types of School Programs and the Total Population . . . 32

13 The Numbers and Percents of Teachers Who Identified Personnel Available to Assist the Teacher with Special Needs Students in the Regular Home Economics Program Classified on Type of Assistance in Four Types of School Programs and the Total Population 33

14 The Numbers and Percents of Teachers Who Identified Preferred Types of Formal Schooling Suggested for Teaching Special Needs Students in Regular Classes in Four Types of School Programs and the Total Population 34

15 The Numbers and Percents of Teachers Who Identified Preferred Types of Preparatory Offerings in Teaching Special Needs Students in Regular Classes in Four Types of School Programs and the Total Population 35

16 The Numbers and Percents of Teachers Who Identified Preferred Locations Suggested for Providing Formal Schooling in Teaching Special Needs Students in Regular Classes in Four Types of School Programs and the Total Population 35

17 The Numbers and Percents of Teachers Who Identified a Preferred Time Schedule Suggested for Providing Formal Schooling in Teaching Special Needs Students in Regular Classes in Four Types of School Programs and the Total Population 36

APPENDICES

A A Survey of Secondary Home Economics Teachers; Numbers and Types of Special Needs Students in Minnesota Programs 37-40

B Cover Letter for Survey Form 41

C Follow-up Letter 42

D Follow-up Post Card 43

E A List of Modifications in Home Economics and/or Space and Equipment Reported by Selected Minnesota Home Economics Teachers . 44-47

F Concerns of Home Economics Teachers Relative to Special Needs Students in Home Economics Classrooms 48

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Over a period of several years, attention has been focused on the need of home economics teachers for special preparation to assist them in providing meaningful programs for the increasing numbers of students who have serious exceptionalities or special needs.

For many years, our national purposes in education has included the goal of assisting every individual to develop as fully as he/she is capable. Although the ideal of equality of opportunity in education has not been fully achieved, in recent years evidence of progress toward that goal has included: federal grants to encourage specialized programs, state legislation, court decisions concerning individual rights, and the rise in concern for equal educational opportunity. (Rossmiller, Hale and Frohreich, 1970; Reynolds, 1974a; and McLure, 1975).

In Minnesota, it appears that consideration is increasingly given to moving those who are exceptional and disadvantaged from centralized institutions to home care or community centers. A study which was discussed in a 1975 legislative seminar sponsored by the Minnesota Vocational Association reported that, although 20 percent of the handicapped students were "mainstreamed" into regular school programs, 80 percent of the handicapped are still enrolled in segregated programs. Moreover, it was pointed out that the intent of Congress favored enrolling exceptional students in "mainstreamed" programs and that these programs may be expected to increase. At the same time it was noted that Minnesota is a leader in this development. In a mid-March 1975 vocational education seminar, Dean Jack Merwin of the University of Minnesota College of Education, and Assistant State Commissioner of Education, Robert Van Tries, referred to the increasing numbers of "mainstreamed" programs provided to meet the needs of exceptional or special needs students, both at the secondary and post-secondary levels.

What does this mean to the regular teacher of the class who receives several exceptional students? Students involved in the clinical experience in Home Economics Education at the University of Minnesota have called attention to the range of learning difficulties represented in classes to which they were assigned. A substantial number of high school students were identified as "exceptional" in one or more respects or had special needs. The concern for achieving competence in providing meaningful experiences for these special needs students contributed to the recognition of needs for this study.

The career education concept was introduced several years ago and has been implemented in a substantial number of Minnesota school systems. With the revision of Chapters III and IV of the State Board Rules and Regulations Handbook in the State Department of Education, further modifications in junior and senior high school programs are anticipated. As increasing numbers of the identified career clusters are introduced or modified in the local school systems, changes may be anticipated in the number and kinds of offerings which will be provided boys and girls. With respect to the clusters to which home economics teachers may be expected to contribute, attention should be focused on the range and degree of differences among students which may be anticipated when "mainstreaming" is more fully implemented in Minnesota schools.

For many years, exceptional or special needs students have been enrolled in home economics programs at some time in their educational experience. However, as special education has been defined to include larger numbers of students with fewer and less severe handicaps, increasingly students have been provided experience in separate programs. Attention is now being given to phasing all but the most severely handicapped students into the regular school programs. It is anticipated that more students with a greater variety of exceptionalities or special needs will be enrolled in the programs that provide for the life survival skills and the career clusters for which home economics teachers are responsible. These home economics programs are offered on both the exploratory and preparatory levels. Consequently, this appears to be a subject which warrants attention for special study.

PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THIS STUDY

General Phases of the Project

The general purpose of the more inclusive project of which this study is a necessary preliminary is to adapt the home economics education program so as to expedite the fulfillment of the students' individual needs for life survival skills and/or preparation for a home economics related occupation. Although the scope of the problem is extensive, the project has been organized into four phases.

The purpose of Phase I, which is reported on in this study, was to assess the extent to which Minnesota secondary home economics teachers identify problems in providing for the students whom they describe as being exceptional or having

special needs. The findings of the study were viewed as having implications for developing adaptive materials (Phase II) as well as for modifying both in-service teacher education (Phase III) and pre-service teacher preparation programs (Phase IV) to include specialized skills in dealing more effectively with increasing numbers of exceptional or special needs students in secondary home economics programs.

A preliminary exploration was made through a series of informal interviews with selected specialists and a few Minnesota secondary home economics teachers. Based upon the information obtained, plans for the project proposal were developed and the proposal was later approved.

The specific objectives of Phase I of the study were identified so as to make it possible to design an instrument which would provide the needed information and data. These objectives were then formulated as questions:

1. How many females and males enrolled in home economics classes in selected Minnesota secondary schools were identified by the teachers as exceptional or special needs students?
2. What modifications in the home economics program were provided for teaching exceptional or special needs students?
3. What modifications in space and equipment were provided for the home economics program to assist in meeting the needs of exceptional or special needs students?
4. What kinds and how much recent preparation relating to teaching exceptional or special needs students were reported by the selected home economics teachers?
5. What kinds and how much experience related to teaching exceptional or special needs students were reported by the selected home economics teachers?
6. What were the attitudes of the selected home economics teachers relative to teaching exceptional or special needs students in the regular classroom?
7. What provision was made for special needs specialists and/or counselors to serve as consultants to the selected home economics classroom teachers?
8. Was there an expressed need on the part of the selected home economics teachers for specialized preparation in teacher education to assist them in working with exceptional or special needs students?
9. Although students with exceptionalities or special needs may be phased into the regular classes at various levels and in differing areas of home economics, what pattern appeared to be customary in the schools represented in the study?

Assumptions of the Study

1. The data were gathered in the spring of the year. This allowed even new teachers sufficient experience in their present position (approximately two-thirds of a year) to have information and responses about their programs and their needs.

2. The responses of part-time teachers were assumed to be as valid as those of full-time teachers.
3. It was assumed that the responses of non-respondents would not have differed significantly from responses of the respondents.
4. The responses to the survey form were assumed to reflect accurately the views of the respondents.

Limitations of the Study

1. The study was limited to a stratified random sample of Minnesota secondary home economics teachers whose names appeared on the computer printout (dated January 24, 1976) which was provided by the Vocational-Technical Division of the State Department of Education.
2. The programs were varied as to the age levels of students.
3. Programs were at varying stages of development.
4. The study was limited to the voluntary responses of the secondary home economics teachers included in the sample rather than the total population.
5. Responses of the subjects in the study were dependent upon relatively consistent interpretation of questions.
6. The study was limited by the availability of accurate enrollment data.

Definition of Terms

The definitions included below are those used as a basis for the study.

Home Economics for the purposes of the survey included Consumer Homemaking, Family Living, Food Occupations, Child Care, Clothing Occupations, and Grooming Services.

Home economics teachers were those individuals identified on the computer printout provided by the State Department of Education who held certificates classified in Home Economics and whose programs were identified as home economics subject matter areas in grades seven through twelve.

Mainstreaming is the implementation of the principle of educating most children in the same classrooms and providing special education for them on the basis of learning needs rather than categories of handicaps. (Reynolds, Maynard C., "Foreword"; Birch, Jack W., Mainstreaming: Educable Mentally Retarded Children in Regular Classes, 1974b).

Special needs students were identified as students being exceptional or having special needs as follows:* 1) physically handicapped; 2) hearing impaired

*(Rossmiller, Hale and Frohreich, 1970, p. 22). The categories of exceptional or special needs students reported by Rossmiller, Hale and Frohreich "as identified by most authorities" were basic in the planning of this study. However, as the instrument was reviewed by selected individuals in Education and Special Education, the terms enumerating the categories of special needs were modified somewhat.

(serious); 3) visually handicapped (serious); 4) intellectually gifted; 5) slow learning (71-90 I.Q.); 6) educable mentally retarded (51-70 I.Q.); 7) trainable mentally retarded (35-50 I.Q.); 8) emotionally disturbed; 9) behavior problems(s) (serious); 10) reading problem(s) affecting classwork; 11) non-reading; and 12) mathematics problem(s) affecting classwork.

METHODOLOGY

Development of the Survey Form

The survey form was devised by the investigator with the assistance of personnel in 1) the Measurement Services Center, University of Minnesota, 2) the Minnesota Research Coordinating Unit and 3) the State Department of Education. After some revision, the survey form was reviewed by selected teacher educators and supervisors in the Twin Cities area. For pre-testing, the device was administered to selected secondary home economics teachers. The instrument was further refined and reviewed by teacher educators and personnel in the Division of Vocational Education in the Minnesota State Department of Education (see Appendix A).

The instrument consisted of questions relating to five areas of information. The first type related to the description of the teachers (items 1-9 of the survey) and their school environment (items 10-14). Short "multiple choice" questions were included concerning the teachers' background preparation, whether formal or informal, in teaching special needs students (items 16 & 17). A third group of questions was concerned with teachers' preferences as to program and scheduling arrangements for supplementary preparation in teaching exceptional or special needs students (items 18-22). Another section of the survey (page three) related to the types of exceptional or special needs females and males who were enrolled in the respondents' classes. Respondents were asked to indicate their assessment of the level of adequacy they experienced in working with each type of special needs student. In addition, the home economics teachers were asked to describe changes in the program and/or space and equipment which they had made in order to provide for students with special needs. The fourth page of the survey form consisted of an opinion inventory which included twenty-five statements concerning special needs students in home economics programs.

Population and Sample

The population of the study included the secondary school home economics teachers of Minnesota. To achieve the objectives of Phase I of the study within the limitation of personnel and financial resources, the decision was made to secure data for the feasibility study by means of a questionnaire sent to a stratified random sample of the Minnesota secondary home economics teachers.

Sampling Procedures

In order to identify the population of home economics teachers in the Minnesota secondary schools, a computer printout was provided by the Vocational-Technical Division of the State Department of Education. The strata of the sample were identified in terms of the grade levels reported on the teachers' schedules for the year 1975-76, which were provided on the printout. The junior high school teachers, 431 in number, were identified as those whose programs included grades 7, 8, and 9. Available data concerning the organization of Minnesota schools indicate that approximately 56 percent of the secondary schools are identified as 4-year high schools or as 6-year schools. Inasmuch as these tend to be smaller attendance units, it was deemed advisable to include data from a sample of the 486 home economics teachers who teach in these schools. The senior high school teachers, 361 in number, were identified as those included in grades 10, 1, and 12. For the purposes of this study, certain groups classified as elementary, middle school, and open school, were not included for consideration. The numbers of teachers in these classifications were too few to assure usable pooled data.

A random sample was chosen. The total number of teachers (225) in the three sub-groups represented 17.6 percent of the 1,278 Minnesota secondary home economics teachers.

A recent development in home economics education which has emerged since the passage of the 1963 Vocational Education Act is identified as occupational programs. Consequently, the number of teachers employed in those programs was modest in comparison with those in the other sub-groups. To insure a usable sample, the entire population of 139 secondary occupational teachers was included in this study. Therefore, the 364 teachers included in the study represented 25.7 percent of the total number of 1,417 Minnesota secondary home economics teachers.

Follow-up Procedures

On March 3, 1976, the survey forms were mailed to the 364 selected Minnesota secondary home economics teachers included in the study. A follow-up letter

enclosing a duplicate survey form was mailed to the 217 teachers who had not responded to the original inquiry by March 19, 1976 (see Appendix C). By April 6, 260 teachers, 71.4 percent of the sample, had returned the survey form. Using random sampling techniques, 20 percent of the non-respondents on that date were identified for follow-up by a telephone call concerning any questions the teachers might have about the survey and asking them to respond. After April 20, a follow-up post card was sent to the non-respondents urging them to reply (see Appendix D).

Analysis of the Follow-up Data

On May 6, 1976 the 27 surveys from those teachers who responded to the follow-up inquiries were analyzed separately (see Table 1). The data were compared with the summary of the responses from the 260 teachers who responded prior to April 6, 1976. After careful examination of the data analyzed for the two groups, no differences could be observed between those who responded promptly and those who responded later. Therefore, there was no additional follow-up, and the final report was based upon the responses of the 260 selected Minnesota secondary home economics teachers, who comprised 71.4 percent of the sample population. Eleven responses were received too late to be included with the 27 surveys in the computerized data for the follow-up group. However, the free response information provided on all of the 298 survey forms which were received, 81.9 percent of the sample population, was analyzed and included in the report.

Analysis of the Data

The replies to each item on pages one, two and three of the survey were tablulated with respect to frequency and/or percentage. Many of the selected teachers responded with comments not only on the section of the survey on page three where free response was requested but also on other sections of the survey form. The free response was summarized and included in the report.

On page four of the survey, the opinion inventory consisted of 25 statements on which the selected teachers were asked to check their responses. Means were calculated on each item for the teachers in each type of program by giving the possible answers a numerical value. For example, on each item for which a respondent marked "strongly agree," the response was assigned a value of one, while a response on which a respondent marked "strongly disagree" was assigned a value of four. Upon careful examination, no observable differences were found between the responses of the teachers in the different program groups. The data were therefore considered for the sample population as a whole.

The findings of the study were organized for the report in terms of the responses to the questions included in Section I.

RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS PROVIDED BY THE SURVEY DATA

Information about the Home Economics Teachers in the Sample Population

To provide background information useful in interpreting the data, a brief description of the selected secondary home economics teachers and the programs in which they teach is provided. Only a summary of those responses for which a consistent trend was noted is presented.

In describing their major teaching responsibilities, 63 percent of the secondary home economics teachers in the sample population reported their major responsibilities as the consumer homemaking program, whereas 25 percent indicated that they taught occupational home economics programs. Of the remaining respondents, 6 percent described their responsibilities as a combination of the two programs and 6 percent indicated they were specialized, as for example, foods or child care, or checked "other" without comment (see Table 2).

Of the responses relative to the number of home economics teachers assigned to their school building, the largest number was found in the "3" category. However, in the "mixed grades (7-12)" group, 65 percent of the teachers reported as the only home economics teacher. Concerning the average size of their classes, 50 percent of the respondents reported "13-20" students per class, whereas 35.8 percent had "21-28" students and 4.6 percent had "29 or more." However, 31 percent of the teachers in the "mixed grades (7-12)" group reported "21-28" students, and 4 percent had "29 or more" per class.

When the teachers indicated their years of teaching experience, the largest number was found in the "0-4 years" category and the second largest group in the "5-9 years" (see Table 3). With respect to the age groups of the respondents, 35 percent of the teachers checked the "26-34 years" category, whereas the balance of the sample population was evenly divided among the other three categories (see Table 4). Thus, when planning in-service education programs consideration must be given to the wide variation among the respondents in terms of their professional interests and needs, motivation, and years of teaching experience.

Questions With Responses Provided by the Data of the Study

Question No. 1: How many females and males enrolled in home economics classes in selected Minnesota secondary schools were identified as exceptional or special needs students?

A summary was made of the number of special needs females and males enrolled in the regular home economics classes as reported by the selected teachers. Table 5 shows the actual numbers reported and the calculated percentages for special needs students, other students, and total students, divided by sex and type of school program. Approximately 8 percent of the female population of programs in junior high, mixed grades, and senior high school were identified as exceptional or special needs students. The older age groups of the males included more special needs students than did the younger age groups: senior high, 15 percent; and occupational, 22 percent; mixed grades, 12 percent and junior high, 8 percent. Occupational programs for both females and males had a higher percentage of special needs students than did the other home economics programs in the sample: 12 percent for females and 22 percent for males (see Table 5).

Of the 260 teachers who returned responses, 25 percent did not respond to the question for females; 26 percent did not respond for males. The number of special needs students reported on Table 5 may be viewed as conservative. On a number of survey forms, the respondents included free response comments to explain the omission of the number of special needs students. For example, selected comments included: "Does not include reading problems," "We do not classify sutdents" and "The gifted are not identified and the staff is discouraged from checking individual records for this information." Although such comments were few in number, nevertheless they suggested that the reported numbers of special needs students enrolled in the regular home economics classes were conservative estimates.

Table 6 summarizes in rank order the number of special needs females, and Table 7 summarizes in rank order the number of special needs males reported by the teacher respondents in the sample population. The types of special needs with the largest number of students identified in the secondary home economics programs were: reading problems, slow learning, mathematics problems, and behavior problems among males in junior high school programs.

In addition to the types of special needs identified on page three of the survey form, a few teacher respondents reported additional categories in the free response which are labeled "other" in Tables 6 and 7. The types of special needs as perceived by the teacher respondents included: diabetics(2),* foreign students (Vietnamese)(3), socially handicapped(2), family problems(4),

*Number of respondents who made comments and identified these additional types of special needs.

potential drop-outs(3), pregnant girls(2), alcoholics(1) and drug problems(3).

The numbers of special needs students identified by the respondents on page three of the survey and reported in Tables 6 and 7 were higher than the numbers of special needs students reported by the teachers on page one of the survey as shown in Table 5. In part, the differences may be accounted for in terms of the higher percentage of non-respondents (25.5 percent of 260 respondents) for the section concerning enrollments on page one in comparison with 3.4 percent of the 260 respondents who did not reply on page three of the survey. In addition, the non-respondents of the section concerning enrollments on page one may be different individuals from the non-respondents on page three which asked for numbers and types of special needs students in the respondents' classes. The substantially greater number of respondents on page three as well as the number and types of special needs students identified may suggest that the information provided in Tables 6 and 7 is more accurate data.

Question No. 2: What modifications in the home economics program were provided for teaching exceptional or special needs students?

From the number and types of explanatory responses concerning modifications in the home economics program, there was little doubt that the participating teachers have tried to make changes to better serve the special needs students in their classes. These responses indicated what teachers have done with the current resources available. It does not answer the question relative to what could or should be done if additional resources were available.

Table 8 summarizes the number of the 260 selected Minnesota home economics teachers who responded with comments related to the modifications which teachers made for the special needs students. Columns 1-4 of Table 8 indicate the number of teachers responding with comments on how they adapted their programs or space and/or equipment for each type of special needs student. For example, concerning the slow learner, the special needs with the greatest number of responses, 23 junior high teachers made comments on "how they adapted their programs and/or space and equipment." Thirty-one senior high teachers and 25 teachers in the mixed grades (7-12) reported changes for the slow learner, whereas 51 teachers in occupational programs so reported. Because a number of the teachers reported more than one comment concerning their situation, a total of 130 teachers in Column 5 reported 156 comments in Column 6. However, in several instances, a number of respondents made similar comments; this resulted

in a larger number of respondents in relation to the total number of comments. For example, concerning the intellectually gifted students, 66 teachers responded; however, the summary reflects 60 comments.

Free response comments on the survey indicated concern and enumerated changes made by the respondents to modify home economics classes for special needs students. A few teachers indicated that modifications were not needed. Rather than emphasizing program or space and equipment, comments reflected that teachers in the sample population adapted instruction for special needs students by:

(1) Adapting teaching methods (85, or 11 percent of the 771 free response comments, referred to individual instruction used as a modification);

(2) Using the help of other professional personnel as resource persons (63, or 8.1 percent of the 771 free response comments, reported consultation and cooperation with special education personnel; and 19, or 2.5 percent of the 771 free response comments, reported assistance from the school counselor or social worker in situations involving students with severe behavior problems or emotional disturbance);

(3) Using additional help (39, or 5 percent of the 771 free response comments, related to the use of aides or tutors, whereas 31, or 4 percent of the 771 comments, indicated that other students helped the special needs students). Working with parents was also included in a number of comments;

(4) Modifying materials (26, or 3.3 percent of the 771 free response comments, related to the increased use of visual aids; additional comments referred to the use of the tape recorder, adaptive teacher-made materials including preparation of multi-level materials, study sheets, and individualized projects).

In several instances teachers' comments tended to cluster in larger numbers around certain modifications, which might be interpreted as "preferred" procedures mainly because they were "most often reported." As a consequence the conclusion that modifications mentioned most frequently are to be preferred may tend to de-emphasize useful and insightful comments made by one or a few individuals who have had substantial experience and/or preparation in the special needs area under consideration. One example of the clustering effect was shown in the area of hearing impairment. Twenty-four of the total of 74 comments about modifying the teaching/learning situation for the hearing-impaired student suggested altering the seating arrangement so the hearing-impaired student sat near the front of the room. Over one-half of the respondents used this as their only comment on modification for the hearing-impaired. However, the following list serves as one excellent example of valuable information reported by one individual who had experience and/or special training in the area of teaching the hearing-impaired student:

"Presentation techniques--

face the class
don't move around too frequently
avoid standing in front of windows
write more on the blackboard
move toward other students who are talking so the hearing-impaired knows where to look
repeat what others have said."

The modifications reported by the respondents in the sample population were listed in order of frequency with respect to home economics programs and/or space and equipment. The reader is encouraged to interpret the list as reflecting procedures which were used in home economics classes and not necessarily as "recommended" for use under other circumstances (see Appendix E).

Question No. 3: What modifications in space and equipment are provided for the home economics program to assist in meeting the needs of exceptional or special needs students?

In responding to Question No. 2 (see pages 10, 11 and 12), the free response comments of the participating home economics teachers indicated concern and reported their experiences in trying to make changes for the benefit of the special needs students in their classes. The responses reflected what teachers have done with available resources but did not take into account what could or should be done in the event that additional resources were available.

Although fewer specific comments were reported concerning modifications in space and equipment, the responses indicated that teachers adapted instruction for special needs students by:

(1) Adapting facilities to meet student needs, for example, by adjusting the levels of work areas through the use of a table instead of the usual counter space or by the judicious use of extension cords on equipment to facilitate use by students.

(2) Providing for greater variety of instructional aids for use by individuals and groups. Examples cited were:

(a) For the hearing-impaired students, the increased use of chalkboards, a microphone, and/or a variety of visual aids were reported;

(b) In situations involving the visually handicapped student, the tape recorder, selected Braille books, and equipment identified with Braille were described;

(c) In working with slow learners, substantial numbers of respondents stressed the need for individualizing instruction, providing more "hands-on experiences," and incorporating more demonstrations in class instruction. In addition, a number of teachers reported that textbooks with varying reading levels were provided and that a typewriter with large type facilitated the use of study sheets and written materials.

Provision for the experiences suggested by the respondents in the sample population would appear to require increased resources for the purchase of the additional equipment and the required instructional supplies. For more detailed information concerning the free response comments, refer to "A List of Modifications in the Home Economics Programs and/or Space and Equipment Reported by Selected Minnesota Seconary Home Economics Teachers" (see Appendix E).

Question No. 4: What kind and how much recent preparation relating to teaching exceptional or special needs students are reported by the selected home economics teachers?

Table 9 indicates that the selected home economics teachers reported limited formal preparation for teaching special needs students. However, what preparation the respondents reported was identified as "most helpful." The largest group, 96 or 37 percent of the respondents, reported that they had no formal preparation for teaching exceptional or special needs students. Yet the findings (see Question No. 1, pages 8, 9 and 10) indicate that special needs students may have been enrolled in the classes of teachers in this group. In addition, 47 teachers, 18.1 percent, failed to respond to this question. Of this group of teachers, one can only speculate as to whether or not these teachers may have had specialized preparation for teaching special needs students in the regular classroom.

In responding to the section of page three of the survey, respondents indicated their feelings of inadequacy in working with the various types of special needs students. Teachers in all four types of secondary programs indicated the highest percentage of inadequacy with respect to teaching trainable mentally retarded students. Other types of special needs students identified with teachers' feelings of inadequacy above the 50 percent level were: junior high teachers, emotionally disturbed; and mixed grades (7-12) teachers, visually handicapped, non-readers, educable mentally retarded and emotionally disturbed students.

Of those respondents who reported having had specialized preparation, 34 teachers, 13 percent, identified preparation in "social, vocational development"; 25 teachers, 9.6 percent of the respondents, reported preparation for the "educationally disadvantaged." However, less than 6 percent of the respondents in the sample population reported preparation in each of the following areas: "exceptional children," "mental retardation," the "emotionally disturbed," and the "socially maladjusted." Nevertheless, 10 respondents, 3 percent, reported that they are certified as vocational special needs teachers, which would indicate that they met the requirements for specialized preparation in the special needs area.

Question No. 5: What kinds and how much experience related to teaching exceptional or special needs students are reported by the selected home economics teachers?

Sixty-seven, or 25.8 percent of the teachers, reported "acquaintance or family association" as a source of informal experience; "paid employment" accounted for 41 respondents, 15.8 percent; and "volunteer activities" were identified by 32 or 12.3 percent of the selected teachers as preparing them for teaching special needs students (see Table 10).

Forty-two, 16.1 percent, of the selected teachers in the sample population reported that they had no experience related to teaching exceptional or special needs students. Moreover, 54 of the selected teachers, 20.8 percent, failed to complete this question on the survey. Of this group one can only speculate as to how many may also have had no informal experience. Table 10 shows that 17 respondents, 6.5 percent, reported that they had "other" experiences which they felt prepared them to deal effectively with special needs students. Comments on a number of the surveys described the respondents' experiences. For example, two teachers had provided foster care, another had taught an adult class of retarded women, and two others while still in college had participated in special projects. Other informal experiences which are viewed by respondents as helpful to them in their teaching were as follows: "had experience in the Peace Corps," and "had summer employment with the Minnesota migrant workers program."

Question No. 6: What are the attitudes of the selected home economics teachers relative to teaching exceptional or special needs students in the regular classroom?

To provide information concerning the attitudes of the respondents relative to the teaching of special needs students, the selected teachers were asked to check their views on the opinion inventory consisting of 25 statements. Means were calculated on the numerical values assigned to the responses. Upon careful examination of the means for each statement across the four program groups, no observable differences were found. Therefore, the data were considered for the sample population as a whole. Seven items were found with means ranging between "strongly agree" (1.0) and "agree" (2.0); four items were found with means ranging between "disagree" (3.0) and "strongly disagree" (4.0) (see Table 11). Taken together the means on the responses suggest that the selected home economics teachers had favorable attitudes toward teaching special needs students in the regular home economics program.

Table 11 indicates that the respondents felt that home economics offered the special needs student experiences which contributed to a positive self-concept and was of importance in the students' program. In addition, respondents disagreed strongly with the statement that home economics classes were impractical for the exceptionally gifted student.

Even though 37 percent of the selected teachers reported little or no formal preparation for teaching special needs students (see Table 9), respondents "strongly agree" that teaching techniques and knowledge about special needs students should be included in home economics teacher education in both the in-service and pre-service training.

The selected teachers were asked to indicate their concerns in teaching special needs students. Although 38 percent of the respondents failed to answer this question, the responses provided were in substantial agreement with the attitudes reflected in the opinion inventory. Table 12 shows that 50 of the selected respondents, 19.2 percent, identified "reading level of textbooks is too difficult," and 33 teachers, 12.7 percent, reported "interpersonal relationships among students" as concerns which ranked in first and second places relative to working with special needs students in the home economics program. "Duplicated materials prepared for general use are not readily understood" was checked by 22 respondents, 8.5 percent; and "verbal instructions not readily understood" was identified by 20 teachers, 7.7 percent of the respondents in the selected population. Those responses tended to reinforce the opinions identified in Table 11 on which respondents were in strong agreement that "special needs students have great difficulty with textbooks and teacher-prepared materials selected for general class use." In addition, teachers indicated strong agreement with the statement, "Teachers would be more interested in teaching special needs students if adaptive materials were readily available" as well as the following statement "Home economics teachers should consult special education and resource teachers for suggestions."

In addition to the information which the selected teachers provided in response to questions in the survey, respondents registered by means of free response comments their opinions and concerns relative to having special needs students in home economics classrooms. The unstructured comments fall into the following categories:

(a) demands on teacher time by special needs students(20)*;

(b) large size of classes(16);

*Number of teachers commenting.

(c) type of special need involved(16);

(d) teacher attitude and preparation(10);

(e) grading(9);

(f) effect on other students(7) (see Appendix F).

Although the number of teachers registering these comments is relatively modest, as indicated by the numbers included above, nevertheless one may view these voluntary expressions of concern as areas that the responding home economics teachers wished to emphasize.

These expressions of opinion and concern on the part of the selected teachers in the sample population suggest the desirability of developing instructional materials adapted to the needs of the most prevalent types of exceptional or special needs students. In addition, they give evidence of the need for implementing in-service education programs designed to assist teachers in providing meaningful learning experiences as the adaptive materials are developed and integrated into the regular home economics programs.

Question No. 7: What provision was made for special needs specialists or counselors to serve as consultants to classroom teachers?

Table 13* shows that 140 of the selected home economics teachers, 53.8 percent, identified the special education teacher as assisting them in teaching special needs students in their regular classrooms. The counselor ranked second in providing assistance as reported by 112 teachers, 43.0 percent. A few respondents, for example, 4 from the junior high group, commented that "none of these actually help with the teaching--they are back-up (supportive) only." A senior high teacher pointed out that "counselors answered questions and contribute ideas, but have not worked in the classroom." Another comment related that "help was provided only if the student was physically handicapped." Although substantial numbers of teachers, ranging from 15.8 to 8.0 percent, reported assistance from the school psychologist, the social worker, the tutor, the aide, and the resource teacher, the third largest number, 56 respondents, 21.0 percent, reported "none." Fourteen teachers, 30.4 percent of the program group responsible for programs of mixed grades (7-12), reported "none" in answering this question. These teachers tend more frequently to teach in the smaller attendance units and to be the only home economics teacher in the school. Although supplementary education programs might be planned to meet the needs of teachers in the

*The respondents in some instances checked several types of personnel who were available to assist them.

larger attendance centers, this does not reduce the responsibility of providing assistance for teachers in the smaller schools.

Question No. 8: Is there an expressed need on the part of the selected home economics teachers for specialized preparation in teacher education to assist them in working with exceptional or special needs students?

In supplementing their educational preparation, Table 14 shows that 108 teachers, 41.5 percent, reported a preference for "course(s) taught cooperatively by Home Economics Education and Special Education," whereas 41 teachers, 15.8 percent, preferred an "emphasis on special needs integrated into home economics education classes." In planning supplementary education programs, the wide variation in the education and experiential backgrounds among respondents in the sample population must be given consideration.

If given an opportunity to enroll in an offering dealing with special needs students, 169, 65.0 percent, of the selected teachers indicated preference for attending a workshop. Twenty teachers, 7.7 percent, suggested interest in an internship; 17, 6.5 percent, preferred a college course; and 15, 5.8 percent, a seminar (see Table 15).

In considering the selected home economics teachers' preferences of location in which the additional preparatory offering(s) would be available, 179 teachers, 68.8 percent, indicated that the local high school or Cooperative Center was their first choice; 49 teachers, 18.8 percent, reported their preference was a college or university campus (see Table 16).

In expressing a preference as to when the preparatory offerings on teaching special needs students should be offered, 100 teachers, 38.5 percent, checked summer school; 79 respondents, 30.4 percent, chose scheduling in the late afternoon; and 22 teachers, 8.5 percent, marked late Friday afternoon and Saturday as their choice (See Table 17).

In-service education programs might be planned with due consideration to the preferences expressed by the respondents, yet take into account the constraints under which teacher preparation institutions operate. These findings suggest that consideration be given the provision of education offerings both on college or university campuses in late afternoons and/or in summer school and off-campus in late afternoon(s), and/or on Friday afternoon(s) and on Saturday(s).

Question No. 9: Although students with exceptionalities or special needs may be phased into the regular classes at various levels and in differing areas of home economics, what pattern appears to be customary in the schools represented in the study?

Within the limitation of personnel and financial resources, the study was limited in considering a stratified sample of the Minnesota secondary home economics teachers, grades 7 through 12. The earliest contact with special needs students in these regular home economics programs was at the seventh grade level where approximately 8 percent of both females and males were identified as exceptional or had special needs. At the same time, the older age groups of males were found to have more special needs students (senior high, 15 percent; occupational, 22 percent) than the 12 percent reported in the mixed grades. Although approximately 8 percent of the females in mixed grades and senior high were identified as special needs students, occupational programs for both females and males had a higher percentage of special needs students (12 percent females and 22 percent males) than were reported in the other programs of the study (see Table 5).

SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS

This project (Phase I) was designed as a feasibility study to determine the numbers and kinds of special needs students in the regular secondary home economics classes. Following is a summary of the major findings of this study. Based upon the data presented in the report, the information may be expected to have implications important in designing and implementing Phases II, III and IV of this project.

Percents and Types of Special Needs Students Enrolled in Regular Home Economics Programs as Reported by a Sample of Minnesota Secondary Home Economics Teachers

1. Approximately 8 percent of the female population in the junior high, mixed grades (7-12), and senior high programs in home economics were identified as exceptional or special needs students.
2. The older age groups of the males included more special needs students than did the younger age groups: senior high 15 percent; and occupational, 22 percent; mixed grades, 12 percent and junior high, 8 percent.
3. Occupational programs for both females and males had a higher percentage of special needs students than did the other home economics programs in the sample: 12 percent for females and 22 percent for males.
4. Supplementary information provided by the respondents suggested that the numbers of special needs students were conservative estimates.

5. The special needs of students identified most frequently in the four types of programs (junior high, mixed grades, senior high, and occupational) were: reading problems, slow learning, mathematics problems and behavior problems among males in junior high school programs.

6. Within the limitations of this study, which included teachers of students in grades 7-12 in the sample population, junior high teachers identified a larger number of "intellectually gifted" students in their classes than did other teachers. The teachers of students in the older age groups reported larger numbers of "educable mentally retarded" students in their classes.

Modifications in Program and/or Space and Equipment to Meet the Needs of Special Needs Students as Reported by a Sample of Minnesota Secondary Home Economics Teachers

7. The number and types of explanatory free response comments concerning modifications in the home economics program, space, and equipment left little doubt that the selected home economics teachers have tried to make changes so as to serve the special needs students in their classes more effectively within the constraints of current resources available.

8. Rather than emphasizing program or space and equipment, free response reflected that teachers adapted instruction for special needs students by:

   (a) adapting teaching methods, for example, individualizing instruction;

   (b) using additional help, for example, aides or other students;

   (c) modifying materials, for example, increased use of audio-visual aids;

   (d) using the help of other professional personnel as resource persons, for example, special education personnel or the school counselor.

9. In modifying space and equipment, free response indicated that teachers in the sample population adapted instruction for special needs students by:

   (a) adapting the use of facilities, for example, by adjusting the height of work areas;

   (b) providing for greater variety of instructional aids, for example, a microphone, tape recorder, equipment identified with Braille; and

   (c) individualizing instruction, for example, in providing more "hands-on" experiences and demonstration. Hence, adjustments in the use of resources for supplies and equipment would appear to be required.

Formal and Informal Preparation for Teaching Special Needs Students as Reported by a Sample of Minnesota Secondary Home Economics Teachers

10. Of the respondents 37 percent reported that they had no formal preparation for teaching exceptional or special needs students; 18 percent did not respond to this question.

11. Of the teachers in the sample, 13 percent reported having studied areas concerning "social, vocational development"; and 9.6 percent reported having studied areas concerning the "educationally disadvantaged."

12. Of those responding, 25.8 percent reported "acquaintance or family association" as a source of informal experience preparing them for teaching special needs students.

13. Of those responding, 15.7 percent reported "paid employment," and 16 percent reported "no experience" which prepared them to deal with special needs students in the classroom.

Opinions as Expressed on the Opinion Inventory by a Sample of Minnesota Secondary Home Economics Teachers

14. The selected Minnesota home economics teachers "strongly agreed" that:

    (a) home economics offers the special needs student experiences which contribute to a positive self-concept;

    (b) home economics teachers should consult special education and resource teachers for suggestions;

    (c) teaching techniques and knowledge about special needs students should be included in home economics teachers education:

        1) in-service training, and

        2) pre-service training;

    (d) teachers would be more interested in teaching special needs students if adaptive materials were readily available;

    (e) home economics is a necessary class subject for the special needs student; and

    (f) special needs students have great difficulty with textbooks and teacher-prepared materials selected for general class use.

15. The selected Minnesota home economics teachers "strongly disagreed" that:

    (a) home economics classes are impractical for the exceptionally gifted student;

    (b) other subjects are more important than home economics for the special needs student;

    (c) home economics is too difficult for special needs students;

    (d) special needs students are unable to function in home economics classes because of their lack of mathematics and reading skills.

Concerns Relating to the Teaching of Special Needs Students as Reported by a Sample of Minnesota Secondary Home Economics Teachers

16. Of 62 percent of the respondents answering the question, 19.2 percent identified "reading level of textbooks is too difficult," and 12.7 percent reported "interpersonal relationships among students" as concerns in working with exceptional or special needs students.

17. In addition to providing the information asked for directly in the survey, 78 of the selected teachers registered additional opinions and concerns which fall into the following categories:

    (a) demands on teacher time by special needs students (20)*;

    (b) large size of classes (16);

    (c) type of special need involved (16);

    (d) teacher attitude and preparation (10);

    (e) grading (9);

    (f) effect on other students (7).

*Number of teachers commenting.

18. Of the respondents, 53.8 percent identified the special education teacher as assisting them in teaching special needs students in the regular classroom, while 43 percent reported assistance from the counselor. At the same time, 21 percent of the respondents reported that they had no assistance in teaching special needs students.

Interest Expressed in Supplementary Preparation Relative to Teaching Special Needs Students in the Regular Classroom as Reported by a Sample of Minnesota Seconary Home Economics Teachers

19. In supplementing their preparation relative to teaching special needs students, 41.5 percent reported a preference for a cooperative arrangement between home economics education and special education; 15.8 percent preferred an "emphasis on special needs integrated into home economics education classes."

20. If they were provided an opportunity to enroll in a formal educational activity in teacher education dealing with special needs students, 65 percent of the selected teachers indicated a preference for attending a workshop.

21. Of the respondents, 68.8 percent reported a preference for the educational offering to be available in the "local high school or Cooperative Center"; 18.8 percent preferred the "college or university campus."

22. Of the respondents, 38.5 percent expressed the preference for the educational offering to be available in "summer school"; 30.4 percent preferred the offering scheduled in the "late afternoon."

SELECTED REFERENCES

Birch, Jack W. Mainstreaming: Educable Mentally Retarded Children in Regular Classes. Reston, Virginia: The Council for Exceptional Children, 1974.

Harth, Robert "Manual for the Multidimensional Attitude Scale for Mental Retardation," Columbia, Missouri: Department of Special Education, 1973. (Mimeo).

Kirk, Samuel A. Educating Exceptional Children. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1962.

McLure, William P., Robert A. Burnham and Robert A. Henderson. Special Education: Needs- Costs- Methods of Financing. Champaign-Urbana, Illinois: Bureau of Educational Research, College of Education, University of Illinois, 1975.

Reynolds, Maynard C. "Educating Exceptional Children in Regular Classes," Chicago: Conference, Leadership Training Institute, 1974a. (Mimeo).

_____ "Foreword." In Birch, Jack W. Mainstreaming: Educable Mentally Retarded Children in Regular Classes. Reston, Virginia: The Council for Exceptional Children, 1974b.

Rossmiller, Richard A., James A. Hale, and Lloyd E. Frohreich. Educational Programs for Exceptional Children: Resource Configurations and Costs. Madison, Wisconsin: National Educational Finance Project, Special Study No. 2, Department of Educational Administration, The University of Wisconsin, 1970.

Walker, Helen M. and Joseph Lev. Statistical Inference, New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1953.

Table 1

The Numbers and Percents of Survey Responses from Home Economics Teachers in Each of the Secondary School Programs Summarizing the Surveys Sent, and Follow-up Procedures in Relation to the Total Responses

Types of Secondary School Programs	Responses Received by April 6, 1976		Follow-up Responses Received by May 6, 1976		Responses Received Late--Free Response Used		Total Responses Received by May 12, 1976	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Junior High (N=75)*	57	76.0**	5	6.6	2	2.7	64	85.3
Mixed Grades (7-12 & 9-12) (N=75)	46	61.3	8	10.6	2	2.7	56	74.6
Senior High (N=75)	57	76.0	4	5.3	4	5.3	65	86.6
Occupational (N=139)	100	71.8	10	7.2	3	4.0	113	81.3
Total Responses Received	260	71.4***	27	7.4	11	3.0	298	81.9
Non-respondents	104	28.6					66	18.1
Total Teachers in Sample Population (N=364)	364	100.0					364	100.0

*Survey forms sent selected teachers

**The 76.0 percent listed is of the 57 respondents in relation to the 75 selected teachers from each secondary school program in the sample population.

***The 71.4 percent listed is of the 260 respondents in relation to the 364 selected teachers in the sample population.

Table 2

The Numbers and Percents of Teachers Who Identified Their Major Teaching Responsibilities as Reported from a Sample of Minnesota Secondary Home Economics Teachers

Major Teaching Responsibilities	Teachers	
	N	%
Consumer Homemaking	164	63
Occupational Home Economics	64	25
Consumer Homemaking and Occupational Home Economics Combination	16	6
Child Care	3	1
Foods	6	2
Other	7	3
Total	260	100

Table 3

The Numbers and Percents of Teachers Who Responded Relative to the Number of Years of Experience in Teaching Home Economics as Reported from a Sample of Minnesota Secondary Home Economics Teachers

Years of Teaching Experience	Total Teachers	
	N	%
0 - 4 years	105	40
5 - 9 years	69	27
10 - 14 years	39	15
15 - 19 years	24	9
20 years and over	22	8.5
No response	1	0.5
Total	260	100.0

Table 4

Number and Percents of Teachers Who Identified Their Age Group Membership as Reported from a Sample of Minnesota Secondary Home Economics Teachers

Age Groups	Total Teachers N	%
Under 25 years	55	21
26 - 34 years	92	35
35 - 44 years	56	22
45 and older	57	22
Total	260	100

Table 5

Numbers and Percents of Students Enrolled in Regular Classes in Four Types of School Programs Divided on Special Needs Students and Regular Students as Reported From a Sample of Minnesota Secondary Home Economics Teachers

	Types of Secondary School Programs									
	Jr. High		Mixed Grades (7-12)		Sr. High		Occupational		Total Students	
Student Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Females										
Special Needs Females	285	8	174	9	290	7	349	12	1,098	8.7
Other Females	3,191	92	1,867	91	3,998	93	2,471	88	11,527	91.3
Total Females	3,476	100	2,041	100	4,288	100	2,820	100	12,625	100.0
Males										
Special Needs Males	80	8	71	12	166	15	219	22	536	14.5
Other Males	912	92	515	88	961	85	776	78	3,164	85.5
Total Males	992	100	586	100	1,127	100	995	100	3,700	100.0

Table 6

Rank Order of Numbers and Types of Female Special Needs Students Enrolled in Regular Classes in Four Types of School Programs as Reported from a Sample of Minnesota Secondary Home Economics Teachers

Types of Secondary School Programs							
Junior High N=55 Trs		Mixed Grades N=42 Trs		Senior High N=54 Trs		Occupational N=86 Trs	
Special Need	No.	Special Need	No.	Special Need	No.	Special Need	No.
Reading Problem	331	Reading Problem	132	Reading Problem	163	Reading Problem	246
Slow Learning	245	Slow Learning	116	Slow Learning	133	Slow Learning	205
Mathematics Problem	190	Mathematics Problem	84	Mathematics Problem	82	Mathematics Problem	81
Intellectually Gifted	116	Non-Reader	34	Educable Mentally Retarded	49	Educable Mentally Retarded	55
Emotionally Disturbed	80	Emotionally Disturbed	23	Intellectually Gifted	47	Emotionally Disturbed	50
Non-Reader	78	Intellectually Gifted	23	Behavior Problem	35	Intellectually Gifted	41
Behavior Problem	59	Educable Mentally Retarded	21	Emotionally Disturbed	31	Behavior Problem	40
Educable Mentally Retarded	31	Trainable Mentally Retarded	19	Non-Reader	16	Non-Reader	34
Hearing Impaired	30	Other	18	Hearing Impaired	16	Other	23
Visually Impaired	22	Behavior Problem	16	Visually Impaired	13	Hearing Impaired	11
Physically Handicapped	13	Hearing Impaired	11	Other	8	Physically Handicapped	5
Other	4	Visually Impaired	10	Trainable Mentally Retarded	7	Trainable Mentally Retarded	4
Trainable Mentally Retarded	3	Physically Handicapped	6	Physically Handicapped	6	Visually Impaired	2

Table 7

Rank Order of Numbers and Types of Male Special Needs Students Enrolled in Regular Classes in Four Types of School Programs as Reported from a Sample of Minnesota Secondary Home Economics Teachers

Types of Secondary School Programs							
Junior High N=55 Trs		Mixed Grades N=42 Trs		Senior High N=54 Trs		Occupational N=86 trs	
Special Need	No.	Special Need	No.	Special Need	No.	Special Need	No.
Slow Learning	127	Slow Learning	116	Reading Problem	118	Reading Problem	139
Reading Problem	106	Mathematics Problem	67	Slow Learning	74	Slow Learning	111
Behavior Problem	73	Reading Problem	65	Mathematics Problem	36	Mathematics Problem	107
Mathematics Problem	53	Non-Reader	30	Behavior Problem	21	Behavior Problem	47
Non-Reader	45	Trainable Mentally Retarded	23	Educable Mentally Retarded	19	Emotionally Disturbed	26
Educable Mentally Retarded	34	Behavior Problem	17	Emotionally Disturbed	14	Intellectually Gifted	20
Intellectually Gifted	33	Emotionally Disturbed	17	Non-Readers	13	Non-Readers	19
Emotionally Disturbed	26	Other	12	Intellectually Gifted	11	Educable Mentally Retarded	17
Hearing Impairment	16	Hearing Impairment	6	Hearing Impairment	10	Hearing Impairment	11
Physically Handicapped	9	Intellectually Gifted	6	Other	7	Other	8
Visual Impairment	6	Physically Handicapped	6	Visual Impairment	4	Physically Handicapped	5
Trainable Mentally Retarded	2	Educable Mentally Retarded	5	Physically Handicapped	3	Visual Impairment	1
Other	2	Visual Impairment	2	Trainable Mentally Retarded	2	Trainable Mentally Retarded	1

Table 8

The Number of Teachers Who Made Modifications in Their Regular Classes in Four Types of School Programs Because of Special Needs Students Classified by Type of Need and the Total Numbers and Percents of Comments as Reported from the Sample of Minnesota Secondary Home Economics Teachers

Type of Special Need Identified	Number of the Selected Teachers Responding from Each Type of Secondary School Program						
	Junior High	Mixed Grades (7-12)	Senior High	Occupational	Respondents	Total Comments of Each Type	
	N	N	N	N	N	N	%
Slow Learner	23	25	31	51	130*	156***	22.0
Reading Problems	26	19	29	42	116	143	18.5
Educable Mentally Retarded	9	8	18	25	60	80	10.0
Hearing Impaired	17	8	15	15	55	74	9.6
Intellectually Gifted	14	8	18	26	66**	60	7.7
Emotionally Disturbed	11	5	9	17	42	53	6.8
Non-Reader	13	6	14	14	47	51	6.5
Behavior Problems	14	8	6	14	42	45	5.7
Mathematics Problems	11	8	9	26	54	44	5.6
Visually Handicapped	9	3	10	3	25	33	4.0
Physically Handicapped	7	3	6	8	24	20	2.5
Trainable Mentally Retarded	2	2	8	4	16	12	1.5
Total	156	103	173	245	677	771	100.0

*The respondents in some instances included one or more comments in a category; therefore, the number of responses does not total the respondents. For example, in Column 5 for the slow learner 130 teachers reported 156 comments in Column 6.

**A number of respondents made similar comments resulting in a larger number of respondents in relation to the number of comments. For example, responses concerning the intellectually gifted in Column 5, 66 teachers responded, yet in Column 6, 60 comments were reported.

***The percentages of comments of each type refer to the percentage of the total comments reported. For example, the 156 comments concerning slow learners is 22 percent of the total of 771 comments.

Table 9

The Numbers and Percents of Teachers Who Received Formal Preparation for Teaching Special Needs Students in Each of the Special Needs Areas in Four Types of School Programs and the Total Population as Reported from a Sample of Minnesota Secondary Home Economics Teachers

Special Needs Areas of Formal Preparation	Types of Secondary School Programs									
	Junior High		Mixed Grades (7-12)		Senior High		Occupational		Total Teachers	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	22	38.6	17	37.0	17	30.0	40	40	96	37.0
Social, vocational development	9	15.8	6	13.0	7	12.3	12	12	34	13.0
Educationally disadvantaged	6	10.5	7	15.2	4	7.0	8	8	25	9.6
Emotionally disturbed	4	7.0	2	4.3	3	5.2	6	6	15	5.8
Mental retardation	4	7.0	2	4.3	3	5.2	6	6	15	5.8
Exceptional children	2	3.5	3	6.6	1	1.8	6	6	12	4.6
Socially maladusted	4	7.0	3	6.6	5	8.8	0	0	12	4.6
Other	1	1.8	0	0	2	3.5	1	1	4	1.5
No response	5	8.8	6	13.0	15	26.3	21	21	47	18.1
Total	57	100.0	46	100.0	57	100.0	100	100.0	260	100.0

Table 10

The Numbers and Percents of Teachers Who Received Informal Preparation for Teaching Special Needs Students in Each of the Areas of Informal Preparation in Four Types of School Programs and the Total Population as Reported from a Sample of Minnesota Secondary Home Economics Teachers

Areas of Informal Preparation	Types of Secondary School Programs									
	Junior High		Mixed Grades		Senior High		Occupa-tional		Total Teachers	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Acquaintance or family association	13	22.8	16	34.8	17	30.0	21	21.0	67	25.8
None	15	26.3	9	19.5	8	14.0	10	10.0	42	16.1
Paid employment	10	17.5	5	10.9	7	12.3	19	19.0	41	15.8
Volunteer activities	7	12.3	5	10.9	5	8.7	15	15.0	32	12.3
Other	3	5.3	2	4.4	6	10.5	6	6.0	17	6.5
Student organization	2	3.5	0	0	2	3.5	3	3.0	7	2.7
No response	7	12.3	9	19.5	12	21.0	26	26.0	54	20.8
Total	57	100.0	46	100.0	57	100.0	100	100.0	260	100.0

Table 11

The Attitudes on Teaching Special Needs Students in Regular Classes Measured on a Scale from One to Four in Four Types of School Programs as Reported from a Sample of Minnesota Secondary Home Economics Teachers

Statement	Types of Secondary School Programs			
	Jr. High	Mixed Grades (7-12)	Sr. High	Occupational
	Mean Score	Mean Score	Mean Score	Mean Score
Home economics offers the special needs student experiences which contribute to a positive self-concept.	1.5	1.6	1.7	1.6
Home economics teachers should consult special education and resource teachers for suggestions.	1.5	1.5	1.7	1.7
Teaching techniques and knowledge about special needs students should be included in home economics teacher education:				
a) in-service training	1.5	1.6	1.8	1.6
b) pre-service training	1.6	1.5	1.8	1.6
Teachers would be more interested in teaching special needs students if adaptive materials were readily available.	1.6	1.7	1.7	1.7
Home economics is a necessary class subject for the special needs student.	1.6	1.6	1.8	1.7
Special needs students have great difficulty with textbooks and teacher-prepared materials selected for general class use.	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8
Home economics classes are impractical for the exceptionally gifted student.	3.7	3.7	3.6	3.6
Other subjects are more important than home economics for the special needs student.	3.7	3.6	3.7	3.5
Home economics is too difficult for special needs students.	3.5	3.3	3.4	3.4
Special needs students are unable to function in home economics classes because of their lack of mathematics and reading skills.	3.1	3.0	3.0	3.0

*A mean above 1.0 and below 2.0 indicated "strong agreement" with the statement while a value above 3.0 and below 4.0 means "strong disagreement" with the statement

Table 12

The Numbers and Percents of Teachers Who Identified Concerns in Working with Special Needs Students in Regular Classes in Four Types of School Programs and the Total Population as Reported from a Sample of Minnesota Seconary Home Economics Teachers

Expressed Concerns	Types of Secondary School Programs									
	Jr. High		Mixed Grades		Sr. High		Occupational		Total Teachers	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Reading level of textbooks is too difficult	10	17.6	10	21.7	11	19.4	19	19	50	19.2
Interpersonal relationships among students	7	12.4	9	19.6	8	14.0	9	9	33	12.7
Duplicated materials prepared for general use are not readily understood	10	17.6	1	2.2	6	10.6	5	5	22	8.5
Verbal instructions not readily understood	4	7.0	4	8.7	4	7.0	8	8	20	7.7
Laboratory experiences are too complex	1	1.7	2	4.3	2	3.5	7	7	12	4.6
Inadequate physical facilities	3	5.2	1	2.2	1	1.7	4	4	9	3.5
None	2	3.5	-	-	1	1.7	6	6	9	3.5
Other	1	1.7	1	2.2	-	-	4	4	6	2.3
No response	19	33.3	18	39.1	24	42.1	38	38	99	38.0
Total	57	100.0	46	100.0	57	100.0	100	100.0	260	100.0

Table 13

The Numbers and Percents of Teachers Who Identified Personnel Available to Assist the Teacher with Special Needs Students in the Regular Home Economics Program Classified on Type of Assistance in Four Types of School Programs and the Total Population as Reported from a Sample of Minnesota Secondary Home Economics Teachers

Personnel Available	Types of Secondary School Programs									
	Jr. High N=57		Mixed Grades (7-12) N=46		Sr. High N=57		Occupational N=100		Total Teachers	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Special Education teacher	33	57.9	24	52.2	39	68.4	44	44	140	53.8
Counselor	30	52.6	14	30.4	22	38.6	46	46	112	43.0
None	10	17.5	14	30.4	9	15.7	23	23	56	21.5
School psychologist	11	19.3	7	15.2	10	17.5	13	13	41	15.8
Tutor	7	12.3	3	6.5	8	14.0	14	14	32	12.3
Social worker	8	14.0	2	4.3	7	12.3	14	14	31	11.9
Aide	5	8.8	5	10.9	9	15.7	9	9	28	10.7
Resource teacher	7	12.3	2	4.3	4	7.0	8	8	21	8.0
Other	6	10.5	4	8.7	1	1.7	6	6	17	6.5

*The respondents in many instances checked one or more types of personnel. Therefore, the total number of responses will not be equal to the number of respondents. The percentages refer to the percentages of the total respondents. For example, 140 responses identifying the counselor is 53.8% of the total (260) selected Minnesota secondary home economics teachers.

Table 14

The Numbers and Percents of Teachers Who Identified Preferred Types of Formal Schooling Suggested for Teaching Special Needs Students in Regular Classes in Four Types of School Programs and the Total Population as Reported from a Sample of Minnesota Secondary Home Economics Teachers

Offering and Sponsoring Unit	Types of Secondary School Programs									
	Jr. High		Mixed (7-12) Grades		Sr. High		Occupa-tional		Total Teachers	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Course(s) Taught Cooperatively by Home Economics Education and Special Education	32	56.1	25	54.3	18	31.6	33	33	108	41.5
Emphasis on Special Needs Integrated inot Home Economics Classes	6	10.5	7	14.9	13	22.8	15	15	41	15.8
Course(s) in Home Economics for Special Needs Students Taught by Home Economics Education	10	17.5	7	15.2	6	10.5	11	11	34	13.0
Other	-	-	-	-	2	3.5	3	3	5	11.9
Special Education Course(s) Taught by Special Education	2	3.5	1	2.2	6	10.5	18	18	27	10.4
None	-	-	-	-	2	3.5	2	2	4	1.5
No Response	7	12.4	6	13.1	10	17.5	18	18	41	15.8
Total	57	100%	46	100%	57	100%	100	100%	260	100%

Table 15

The Numbers and Percents of Teachers Who Identified Preferred Types of Preparatory Offerings in Teaching Special Needs Students in Regular Classes in Four Types of School Programs and Total Population as Reported from a Sample of Minnesota Secondary Home Economics Teachers

Type of Offering	Types of Secondary School Programs									
	Jr. High		Mixed Grades (7-12)		Sr. High		Occupational		Teachers	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Workshop	38	66.6	38	82.6	34	59.6	59	59	169	65.0
Internship	3	5.2	2	4.3	6	10.6	9	9	20	7.7
College course	3	5.2	2	4.4	3	5.2	9	9	17	6.5
Seminar	4	7.0	1	2.2	4	7.0	6	6	15	5.8
Independent Study	2	3.6	-	-	3	5.2	4	4	9	3.5
None	-	-	-	-	1	1.8	3	3	4	1.5
Other	1	1.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	0.3
No Response	6	10.6	3	6.5	6	10.6	10	10	25	9.7
Total	57	100%	46	100%	57	100%	100	100%	260	100%

Table 16

The Numbers and Percents of Teachers Who Identified Preferred Locations Suggested for Providing Formal Schooling in Teaching Special Needs Students in Regular Classes in Four Types of School Programs and the Total Population as Reported from a Sample of Minnesota Secondary Home Economics Teachers

Location of Offering	Types of Secondary School Programs									
	Jr. High		Mixed Grades (7-12)		Sr. High		Occupational		Total Teachers	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Local high school or Cooperative Center	37	64.9	34	74.0	38	66.6	70	70	179	68.8
College or university campus	12	21.0	8	17.4	14	24.6	15	15	49	18.8
Other	3	5.3	2	4.3	3	5.3	8	8	16	6.2
No response	5	8.8	2	4.3	2	3.5	7	7	16	6.2
Total	57	100%	46	100%	57	100%	100	100%	260	100%

Table 17

The Numbers and Percents of Teachers Who *Identified a Preferred Time* Schedule Suggested for Providing Formal Schooling in Teaching Special Needs Students in Regular Classes in Four Types of School Programs and the Total Population as Reported from a Sample of Minnesota Secondary Home Economics Teachers

Time When Offered	Types of Secondary School Programs									
	Jr. High		Mixed Grades (7-12)		Sr. High		Occupa-tional		Total Teachers	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Summer school	27	47.4	18	39.1	26	45.6	29	29	100	38.5
Late afternoon	19	33.3	12	26.8	10	17.5	38	38	79	30.4
Late Friday afternoon & Saturday	1	1.7	7	15.2	5	8.8	9	9	22	8.5
Other	2	3.5	-	-	7	12.3	4	4	13	5.0
Saturday mornings	1	1.8	4	8.9	2	3.5	4	4	11	4.2
None	2	3.5	-	-	2	3.5	5	5	9	3.4
No response	5	8.8	5	10.9	5	8.8	11	11	26	10.0
Total	57	100%	46	100%	57	100%	100	100%	260	100%

APPENDIX A

A SURVEY OF SECONDARY HOME ECONOMICS TEACHERS:
NUMBERS AND TYPES OF SPECIAL NEEDS STUDENTS IN MINNESOTA PROGRAMS

Directions: Your responses to the following questions will help educators in Home Economics and Special Education provide support for home economics teachers with mainstreamed exceptional and/or special needs students. Please answer all questions in terms of the 1975-76 school year.

For the purposes of this survey: When using the term Home Economics, we include teachers of Consumer Homemaking, Family Living, Food Occupations, Child Care, Clothing Occupations and Grooming Services, etc.

Special needs students will refer to students being exceptional and/or having special needs as outlined on page 3.

1. In which program do you have your major teaching responsibilities? (Check one)
   Consumer Homemaking ☐ Occupational Home Economics ☐ Other _____

2. In your current assignment, what are your teaching responsibilities?
   Full-time ☐ Part-time ☐ Other _____

3. At which grade level are your major responsibilities? (Check one only)
   7-9 ☐ 7-12 ☐ 10-12 ☐ Other _____

4. What is the highest level of education you have achieved? (Check one only)
   No degree ☐ Bachelor's ☐ Bachelor's plus ☐ Master's ☐ Master's plus ☐
   Doctorate ☐ Other _____

5. How much occupational experience related to your teaching assignment do you have?
   None ☐ 3 or fewer years ☐ 4-9 years ☐ 10 or more years ☐ Other _____

6. In which age group are you?
   Under 25 years ☐ 26-34 ☐ 35-44 ☐ 45 years and older ☐

7. Are you a certified vocational home economics teacher? Yes ☐ No ☐

8. Are you a certified vocational special needs teacher? Yes ☐ No ☐

9. Including this year, how many years have you taught home economics? _____ yrs.

10. What is the average length of class period in your teaching schedule?
    45 or fewer min. ☐ 50 min. ☐ 60 min. ☐ 90 min. ☐ 120 min. ☐ Other ____

11. What is the average size of your classes? (Check one only)
    12 or fewer students ☐ 13-20 ☐ 21-28 ☐ 29 or more students ☐ Other _____

12. In the classes you are currently teaching, how many of the students are:
    special needs females?_____ other females? _____ total females?_____
    special needs males? _____ other males? _____ total males? _____

13. How many students attend the school building in which you teach? (Check one)
    249 or fewer students ☐ 250-499 ☐ 500-749 ☐ 750-999 ☐ 1000-1499 ☐
    1500-1999 ☐ over 2000 students ☐

- over -

APPENDIX A

Page 2

14. How many home economics teachers are assigned to your school building? _____

15. In teaching special needs students in your regular home economics classes, what kind(s) of personnel assist you? Counselor ☐ Special Education teacher ☐ Tutor ☐ School psychologist ☐ Resource teacher ☐ Social worker ☐ Aide ☐ None ☐ Other _____

Directions: In questions 16-22, please answer each question in relation to your situation. Rank items in each question in terms of one (1) which you feel was or would be most helpful; two (2) next most helpful, etc.

16. In which of the following areas have you had formal preparation (college course or workshop) for teaching special needs students?
Exceptional children ☐ Mental retardation ☐ Emotionally disturbed ☐ Socially maladjusted children ☐ Education: Disadvantaged ☐ Social, vocational development ☐ None ☐ Other (please specify) _____

17. What informal experiences do you feel prepared you to deal effectively with special needs students?
Acquaintance or family association ☐ Volunteer activities ☐ Paid employment ☐ Student organizations ☐ None ☐ Other _____

18. If you wished to supplement your preparation for teaching, which arrangement would you prefer?
☐ Special Education course(s) taught by Special Education
☐ Course(s) in Home Economics for special needs students taught by Home
☐ Economics Education
☐ Course(s) taught cooperatively by Home Economics Education and Special
☐ Education
☐ Emphasis on special needs integrated into Home Economics Education classes
☐ None Other _____

19. If you had an opportunity to enroll in a formal activity dealing with special needs students, which would be most helpful to you?
College course ☐ Workshop ☐ Seminar ☐ Internship ☐ Independent study ☐ None ☐ Other _____

20. When would you prefer special needs preparation through class or other offering?
Late afternoon ☐ Saturday mornings ☐ summer school ☐ late Friday afternoon and Saturday ☐ None ☐ Other _____

21. Where would you prefer the special needs course or workshop be made available?
College or University campus ☐ Local high school Cooperative Center ☐
Other _____

22. In teaching home economics classes, what concerns do you have in working with special needs students?
☐ Reading level of textbooks is too difficult
☐ Duplicated materials prepared for general use are not readily understood
☐ Laboratory experiences are too complex
☐ Interpersonal relationships among students
☐ Inadequate physical facilities
☐ Verbal instructions not readily understood
☐ None Other _____

23. Directions:

Column A- In your present teaching assignment, approximately how many special needs students of each type do you have in your classes? (Complete each item.)

Column B- To what degree do you feel able to work effectively with the following types of special needs students? (Circle A if adequate, PA if partially adequate, and I if inadequate. Circle one answer for each type of special need, whether or not you have such students in your classes.)

Column C- Indicate ways you have changed your program to provide for students with special needs. Include modifications in your laboratory equipment as well as procedures used. (Attach additional sheet of paper if extra space is needed.)

Column A Numbers-- Boys	Girls	None	Special Needs	Column B Adequate	Partially Adequate	Inadequate	Column C Changes I have made in program and/or space and equipment.
___	___	___	Physically handicapped (wheel chair, braces etc.)	A	PA	I	_____
___	___	___	Hearing impairment (serious)	A	PA	I	_____
___	___	___	Visually handicapped, (serious)	A	PA	I	_____
___	___	___	Intellectually gifted	A	PA	I	_____
___	___	___	Slow Learner (71-90 I.Q.)	A	PA	I	_____
___	___	___	Educable Mentally Retarded (51-70 I.Q.)	A	PA	I	_____
___	___	___	Trainable Mentally Retarded (35-50 I.Q.)	A	PA	I	_____
___	___	___	Emotionally Disturbed	A	PA	I	_____
___	___	___	Behavior problem (severe)	A	PA	I	_____
___	___	___	Reading problems affecting classwork	A	PA	I	_____
___	___	___	Non-readers	A	PA	I	_____
___	___	___	Mathematics problems affecting classwork	A	PA	I	_____
			Other special needs-list				
___	___	___	_____	A	PA	I	_____
___	___	___	_____	A	PA	I	_____

Comments:

(over)

APPENDIX A
OPINION INVENTORY

Directions:
Please record your opinions by circling the code letter corresponding to your answer. Answer all questions frankly. Use the following scale in marking your answers:

If you strongly agree with the statement, mark SA.
If you agree with the statement in general, mark A.
If you disagree with the statement, mark D.
If you strongly disagree with the statement, mark SD.

1. The special needs student should be integrated into the regular class. SA A D SD
2. Special needs students are an added burden for teachers. SA A D SD
3. Teachers don't have time to develop instructional materials for special needs students. SA A D SD
4. Other subjects are more important than home economics for the special needs student. SA A D SD
5. Including special needs students in regular home economics classes will result in greater understanding between special needs students and other students. SA A D SD
6. Teaching techniques and knowledge about special needs students should be included in home economics teacher education: a) in-service training SA A D SD
   b) pre-service training SA A D SD
7. Teachers would be more interested in teaching special needs students if adaptive materials were readily available. SA A D SD
8. Teachers don't have time to participate in in-service special needs training programs. SA A D SD
9. Regular students should be expected to assist slower or handicapped students. SA A D SD
10. Regular students suffer when special needs students are included in the class. SA A D SD
11. Home economics is too difficult for special needs students. SA A D SD
12. Special needs students are unable to function in home economics classes because of their lack of mathematics and reading skills. SA A D SD
13. Home economics teachers should not be responsible for teaching reading and vocabulary along with the content. SA A D SD
14. Special needs students are more difficult to motivate than other students. SA A D SD
15. All teachers should be expected to participate in in-service training activities that relate to special needs students. SA A D SD
16. Most people over-emphasize the importance of adapting for special needs. SA A D SD
17. Teachers often mislabel students as lazy or unmotivated when actually the problem is lack of reading or mathematics ability. SA A D SD
18. It is a good idea to have separate classes for special needs students and other students. SA A D SD
19. Home economics offers the special needs student experiences which contribute to a positive self-concept. SA A D SD
20. A student organization provides enriching experiences for special needs students. SA A D SD
21. Home economics is a necessary class subject for the special needs student. SA A D SD
22. Home economics teachers should consult special education and resource teachers for suggestions. SA A D SD
23. Special needs students have great difficulty with textbooks and teacher prepared materials selected for general class use. SA A D SD
24. Special needs students should be graded on achievement as are other students. SA A D SD
25. Home economics classes are impractical for the exceptionally gifted student. SA A D SD

Return to: Rose B. Whiteford, Professor
University of Minnesota
Division of Home Economics Education
196 McNeal Hall
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108
March, 1976

Please return by March 22.

APPENDIX B

Cover Letter for Survey Form

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

Division of Home Economics Education
Department of Vocational and Technical Education
College of Education
107 McNeal Hall
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108

March, 1976

Dear Home Economics teacher:

As you are well aware, increased attention is now being focused upon students who are exceptional and/or have special needs. When such students are enrolled in regular home economics courses there may be problems with respect to programming, instruction, equipment, and related matters.

At the University of Minnesota, the Division of Home Economics Education is vitally interested in adapting its offerings so as to prepare teachers to work more effectively with special needs students. A project has been funded through Special Needs resources in the Division of Vocational-Technical Education in the State Department of Education to enable us to carry out this objective.

The enclosed needs assessment has been developed to provide teacher in-put as a basis for action. Teachers who are experiencing the situation can be of great help to us in identifying the number of students who have various types of special needs and informing us as to the procedures now being used in dealing with such students. Your opinions and suggestions as to how we can adapt our programs and teaching resources so as to assist teachers in meeting this classroom situation should be of especial value to us.

All information collected will be kept confidential. The code number on the survey form will be used to facilitate correlations and collective facts about aggregate data. By returning your questionnaire, your consent to use the data in the pool is implied. If you request it, on the perforated form below, I will be pleased to send you a summary of the completed study. To assure your anonymity, the perforated form on which you place your name and school address will be detached from the questionnaire, yet permit us to follow-up on non-respondents.

Please complete the survey form, responding to each item. A stamped envelope is enclosed for your reply. Please return the survey by March 22.

We shall greatly appreciate your cooperation, and we thank you.

In the event you have questions about the survey, please call me at 612-373-1538. I will look forward to receiving your completed reply.

Sincerely,

Emma B. Whiteford

Emma B. Whiteford
Professor

EW:ma

Enclosure 2

Kindly fill in the information requested below and return with the completed survey.

Name _____

School _____

School Address _____
street city state zip code

If you would like a summary of the study, check here ☐

APPENDIX C
Follow-up Letter

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

Division of Home Economics Education
Department of Vocational and Technical Education
College of Education
107 McNeal Hall
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108

March 19, 1976

Dear Homemaking Teacher:

On March 2 a needs assessment survey was mailed to you requesting that you indicate your preferences and opinions about special needs students and in-service education programs. Quite possibly you have completed the survey form and it is in the mail; if so, please disregard this letter.

In planning this project, we found that including the entire population of Minnesota secondary home economics teachers was not economically feasible. From the State Department of Education we were fortunate in securing a print-out of the names of secondary home economics teachers. By using a table of random numbers, we identified a relatively small sample of teachers to whom we directed our inquiry. This explains why you have received our request that you participate in the study and underscores the importance of including your response in the summary of the findings.

In the hope that circumstances are now such that you will have an opportunity to complete the survey, we are mailing another copy to you. Won't you please place this questionnaire at the top of your "to-do" pile and send it to us at your earlist convenience? Your response will be appreciated!

Sincerely,

Emma B. Whiteford

Emma B. Whiteford
Professor

EW:kg

Enclosure

APPENDIX D

Follow-up Post Card

Dear _____,

This is a follow-up to our telephone conversation of May _____.

Only a selected group of Minnesota home economics teachers were asked to participate in this study and therefore, every response is very important.

Your time is greatly appreciated . . . thank you for moving the completion of this survey to the top of your "work pile."

Thank you again . . .

Linda Tillman
for Dr. Emma Whiteford

APPENDIX E

A list of Modifications in Home Economics Programs and/or Space & Equipment Reported by Selected Minnesota Home Economics Teachers

Physically Handicapped (20 comments)

Get or make adaptive materials and equipment (5 comments)
- --adapt the levels of the work-area
- --use table rather than counter in food preparation
- --put extension cords on some equipments so it can be used away from the counter in foods lab

Provide individual attention or instruction to student (5 comments)
Adapt to Student ability
Some teachers felt there was no change needed (2 comments)

Hearing-Impaired (74 comments)

Have the student sit closer to the front of the room (24 comments)
Direct your conversation and lecture direction toward the hearing-impaired student (8 comments)
Use more written communication (6 comments)
- --use blackboards more
- --provide study sheet or discussion guide for the student to use during verbal discussions or lectures
- --increase classroom and individual use of A-V materials

S.L.B.P. teacher or resource teacher may be of help with suggestions (5 comments)
Use a microphone
Speak slowly
Use an Interpretor (sign-language)
Learn some basic sign-language
Check with the students individually to see if they are comprehending the information and classroom presentation
Educate other students about hearing-impairment
If the student lip-reads to some extent, follow these presentation techniques:
- --face the class
- --don't move around too much (save movemen for meaningful cues)
- --try not to stand in front of a window as this places shadows on your face and makes it impossible for the student to do any lip-reading
- --use your movement to aid the student in following class discussion: move toward a student who is talking so the hearing-impaired student knows where to look
- --repeat what others have said

Intellectually Gifted (60 comments)

Provide advanced, accelerated, or special projects (22 comments)
Individualize instruction or study (17 comments)
Provide "extra credit" projects (11 comments)
Increase alternatives
Contact for Projects
Incorporate DECA competition
Increase classroom participation and discussion time
Provide situations where they may help other students
For some, no change is needed

APPENDIX E (continued)

Visually Handicapped (33 comments)

Have the student sit closer to the front of the room (10 comments)
Use books or materials that have larger print (6 comments)
Read written material out loud
Use a tape recorder for information that otherwise would be read
Some Braille books are available in the Home Economics area
Mark equipment with Braille
Students may bring a Braille typewriter
Work with a vision specialist

Slow Learner (156 comments)

Individualize attention and instruction (31 comments)
Special education teacher may be a help (21 comments)
Other students may help a slow learner keep up with the class (11 comments)
Simplify work or projects (10 comments)
Teach through repetition (7 comments)
Include more demonstration in class presentation
Include more "hands-on" experiences or actual life-like experiences
Offer extra credit
Use learning contracts
Double space material
Allow extra time for completion of tasks
Students may take home assignments
Arrange for slow learning students to do similar but not as complicated lab experiences
Read test to them
Give advance or detailed verbal explanation of assignment or information
Teach in a step-by-step manner . . . one thing building on another
Guide slow learning students to select an appropriate project to assure their success
Use learning packets
Tape-record some information that would otherwise need to be read
Lower teacher expectation
Acquire texts with varying reading levels

Educable Mentally Retarded (80 comments)

Individualize teacher attention and instruction (13 comments)
Special Education teacher may help (9 comments)
Other students may help (7 comments)
Consider student ability when grading and appraising assignments (4 comments)
Increase use of A-V materials and equipment
Have an aide help
Get or make special equipment and materials
Use multi-level texts and projects
Read test orally
Use charts to show success level
Tape-record reading material
Use work-sheets or skill sheets to develop skills
Use repetition in teaching
Simplify tasks
Have a special class of these students
Use large typewriter for study sheets and written information
Adust vocabulary to simple terms
Adjust lab experiences to "simple direction following" experiences
Use over-head for "group reading"

APPENDIX E (continued)

Trainable Mentally Retarded (12 comments)

Individualize instruction and attention (4 comments)
Have other students help
Separate tests

Emotionally Disturbed (53 comments)

Counselor/social worker helps (10 comments)
Psychologist/doctor may provide useful information (6 comments)
Provide individual attention (5 comments)
Decrease pressure in classroom
Develop personal relationship with student
Use behavior reinforcement/such as signing a chart each day
Make atmosphere comfortable and pleasant
Provide a high activity level in the classroom

Behavior Problems (45 comments)

Counselor/social worker helps (7 comments)
Work with principal (6 comments)
Aide/tutor may help
Work with parents
Build self-worth of student
Use a point system
Separate from mainstream of attention
Some students will need to be ignored
Behavior modification
Activity oriented--keep student interested and busy
Be understanding and firm

Reading Problems (143 comments)

Individual attention and instruction (11 comments)
Help of aide or tutor (9 comments)
Help of Special Education/S.L.B.P. teacher (10 comments)
Tape-record readings (11 comments)
Use oral worksheets and testing (11 comments)
Adjust assignment to the individual (7 comments)
Help of reading teacher (8 comments)
Increase use of A-V equipment and materials
Use more "hands'-on" experience
Send assignments home
Go over special vocabulary
Give alternate assignments
Avoid written assignments
Reading groups work together
Choose a lower reading level textbook
Provide study papers with assignments
Teach through repetition
More lecture/discussion
Increase visual and verbal cues

APPENDIX E (continued)

Non-Reader (51 comments)

Oral worksheets and testing (10 comments)
Read out loud in class (4 comments)
Help of tutor/aide
Use more demonstrations/discussions
Tape-record materials
Use individual projects
Provide more verbal/visual help
Read in small groups

Math Problems (44 comments)

Provide individual attention/instruction (10 comments)
Use of class/problem review (6 comments)
Use of worksheets
Use of demonstrations
Use of alternate assignments
Use of supplemental problems
Use computer
Use colors for measuring cups
Include some basic math in teaching
Spend time on specific problems
Spend time for review/drill
Simplify instruction
Teach through repetition

ED 004 714

APPENDIX F

Concerns of Home Economics Teachers Relative to Special Needs Students in Home Economics Classrooms

Teachers responding to the survey registered additional opinions and concerns not only through free response comments encouraged at the bottom of page 3 of the survey but also in the margins and around the edges of the survey itself. These free, unsolicited comments articulate areas of concern and opinions considered of sufficient importance by the respondents to offer in this totally free response manner.

The unsolicited free responses fall into the following categories:

Demands on teacher time--including special needs students in the classroom increases considerably teacher time spent in preparation as well as time spent working individually with special needs students. Frustration was registered as there just is "not enough time" to deal with and prepare for special needs students. (20 teachers commenting)

Class size--special needs students in the classroom would function more successfully and be less of a burden if the classes were not so large. (16 comments)

Type of special need--successful inclusion of special needs students is effected often by the type of special need . . . for instance, teachers commented on the ease in including the physically handicapped student if his/her mental ability is average. (16 commenting)

Teacher attitude and preparation--teacher attitude and preparation was viewed as a deciding factor in the success of including special needs students in regular home economics programs. (10 commenting)

Grading--comparison or competitive grading seemed less appropriate than grading special needs students according to ability. (9 commenting)

Effects on other students--concern for teacher time spent with special needs students exhibits itself in another manner with teachers becoming concerned about time "taken away" from the other students in the classroom. (7 commenting)

Of the respondents, 78 teachers registered above comments which were offered in addition to the information asked for directly in the survey. With this in mind, one may view large class size, demands on teacher time by special needs students, type of special needs, teacher attitude and preparation, grading methods and the effect special needs students have on the other students in the classroom as areas of concern that responding home economics teachers wished to emphasize.

Sponsors:

Special Needs Programs
Vocational—Technical Division
State Department of Education
Saint Paul, Minnesota
August, 1976
Division of Home Economics Education
Department of Vocational and Technical Education
College of Education
University of Minnesota at Minneapolis-Saint Paul